

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-4, 6, and 10-21 are now pending in this application.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given to the claims.

Rejection of claims 1-4, 6, and 10-12 based on Philippe

Claims 1-4, 6, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by FR 2771966 (“Philippe”). For at least the following reasons, this rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 (as amended) recites, among other things, a circumferential surface of a part-cylinder, wherein the circumferential surface forms a first region, two circle segment surfaces forming lateral side surfaces of the part-cylinder, wherein each circle segment surface forms a second region, an externally surrounding rim, which is arranged substantially in two planes, projects perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface along two edges of the circumferential surface that run along a longitudinal direction of the circumferential surface, and serves to bear against correspondingly designed bearing surfaces, at least a second rim projecting perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface, the circle segment surfaces, or a combination thereof, and at least one opening in at least one segment of the first region, one or both of the second regions, or a combination thereof. The at least one segment is delimited by the externally surrounding rim and the second rim. Claim 11 recites similar and/or analogous features. Philippe does not teach or suggest this combination of features.

For instance, Philippe does not teach or suggest an externally surrounding rim, which projects perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface along two edges of the circumferential surface that run along a longitudinal direction of the circumferential surface. Element 64 of Philippe (which the PTO considers to be the externally surrounding rim of claims 1 and 11) does not project perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface along two edges of the surfaces 50 (which the PTO considers to be the circumferential surface of claims 1 and 11). Indeed, the element 64 of Philippe only projects outward from one edge of the surfaces 50. Because Philippe does not teach or suggest an externally surrounding rim

projecting perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface along two edges of the circumferential surface that run along a longitudinal direction of the circumferential surface, claims 1 and 11 are allowable.

Also, Philippe does not teach or suggest at least a second rim projecting perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface, the circle segment surfaces, or a combination thereof. The PTO asserts that the top and side edges of 48 are considered to be the second rim of claims 1 and 11. (Page 2 of the Office Action.) However, these top and side edges do not project perpendicularly outward from the surfaces 50. (Fig. 4 of Philippe.) Indeed, the top and side edges of 48 do not project outward from the surfaces 50. Because Philippe does not teach or suggest at least a second rim projecting perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface, the circle segment surfaces, or a combination thereof, claims 1 and 11 are allowable.

Claims 2-4, 6, 10, and 12 depend from and contain all the features of claim 1 or 11, and are allowable for the same reasons provided above without regard to the further patentable features contained therein.

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 13-21 based on Philippe and Mueller

Claims 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over Philippe and DE 10031991 ("Mueller"). For at least the following reasons, this rejection is traversed.

Claim 13 (as amended) recites, among other things, a part-cylinder surface, which forms a first region, two circle segment surfaces, wherein each circle segment surface forms a second region, an externally surrounding rim, which is arranged substantially in two planes, projects perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface along two edges of the circumferential surface that run along a longitudinal direction of the circumferential surface, and serves to bear against correspondingly designed bearing surfaces, at least a second rim, which serves to bear against a corresponding designed bearing surface, a third region with a planar surface, wherein the second rim extends above the planar surface of the third region and runs substantially around the third region, and a planar intermediate region arranged at an

angle not equal to 180° from the third region. The third region indirectly adjoins a lateral surface in a region of the externally surrounding rim via the intermediate region. Claim 17 recites similar and/or analogous features. Philippe and Mueller do not teach or suggest this combination of features.

For instance, Philippe does not teach or suggest an externally surrounding rim, which projects perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface along two edges of the circumferential surface that run along a longitudinal direction of the circumferential surface. Element 64 of Philippe (which the PTO considers to be the externally surrounding rim of claims 13 and 17) does not project perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface along two edges of the surfaces 50 (which the PTO considers to be the circumferential surface of claims 1 and 11). Indeed, the element 64 of Philippe only projects outward from one edge of the surfaces 50. Mueller does not cure this deficiency. Because Philippe and Mueller do not teach or suggest an externally surrounding rim projecting perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface along two edges of the circumferential surface that run along a longitudinal direction of the circumferential surface, claims 13 and 17 are allowable.

Also, Philippe does not teach or suggest a third region with a planar surface, wherein the second rim extends above the planar surface of the third region and runs substantially around the third region. Indeed, the PTO correctly states that Philippe does not teach a third region or an intermediate region. (Page 4 of the Office Action.) Mueller does not cure the deficiencies of Philippe because element 17 (which the PTO equates with the third region of claims 13 and 17) does include a second rim that extends above the planar surface of the element 17. Indeed, the element 17 of Mueller has no rim extending above its planar surface. (Fig. 4 of Mueller.) Because Philippe and Mueller do not teach or suggest a third region with a planar surface, wherein the second rim extends above the planar surface of the third region and runs substantially around the third region, claims 13 and 17 are allowable.

Claims 14-16 and 18-20 depend from and contain all the features of claim 13 or 17, and are allowable for the same reasons provided above without regard to the further patentable features contained therein.

Claim 21 (as amended) recites, among other things, a part-cylinder surface, which forms a first region; two circle segment surfaces, wherein each circle segment surface forms a second region; an externally surrounding rim, which is arranged substantially in two planes,

projects perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface along two edges of the circumferential surface that run along a longitudinal direction of the circumferential surface, and serves to bear against correspondingly designed bearing surfaces; at least a second rim, wherein the second rim serves to bear against a corresponding designed bearing surface or projects perpendicularly outward from a circumferential surface of the part-cylinder surface, the circle segment surfaces, or a combination thereof; and one of: (a) at least one opening in at least one segment of the first region, one or both of the second regions, or a combination thereof such that the at least one segment is delimited by the externally surrounding rim and the second rim; or (b) a third region indirectly adjoining a lateral surface in a region of the externally surrounding rim via a planar intermediate region such that the intermediate region is arranged at an angle not equal to 180° from the third region, which has a planar surface such that the second rim extends above the planar surface of the third region and runs substantially around the third region.

As previously mentioned, Philippe and Mueller do not teach or suggest an externally surrounding rim projecting perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface along two edges of the circumferential surface that run along a longitudinal direction of the circumferential surface. Also, Philippe and Mueller do not teach or suggest a third region with a planar surface, wherein the second rim extends above the planar surface of the third region and runs substantially around the third region. Furthermore, Philippe does not teach or suggest at least a second rim projecting perpendicularly outward from the circumferential surface, the circle segment surfaces, or a combination thereof and Mueller does not cure this deficiency. Because Philippe and Mueller does not teach or suggest these features, claim 21 is allowable.

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 8/13/09

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5540
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Paul D. Strain
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,369